

1 Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)
2 *nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*
3 James Lin (SBN 310440)
4 *jlin@goodwinlaw.com*
5 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
6 135 Commonwealth Drive
7 Menlo Park, California 94025
8 Tel.: +1 650 752 3100
9 Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

10 Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)
11 *bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*
12 Shane Brun (SBN 179079)
13 *sbrun@goodwinlaw.com*
14 Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)
15 *rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*
16 Hayes P. Hyde (SBN 308031)
17 *hhyde@goodwinlaw.com*
18 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
19 Three Embarcadero Center
20 San Francisco, California 94111
21 Tel.: +1 415 733 6000
22 Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

23 Hong-An Vu (SBN 266268)
24 *hvu@goodwinlaw.com*
25 Todd Boock (SBN 181933)
26 *tboock@goodwinlaw.com*
27 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
28 601 S. Figueroa Street, 41st Floor
29 Los Angeles, California 90017
30 Tel.: +1 213 426 2500
31 Fax.: +1 213 623 1673

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

32 *Attorneys for Defendant:*
33 Otto Trucking LLC

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
7010
7011
7012
7013
7014
7015
7016
7017
7018
7019
7020
7021
7022
7023
7024
7025
7026
7027
7028
7029
7030
7031
7032
7033
7034
7035
7036
7037
7038
7039
7040
7041
7042
7043
7044
7045
7046
7047
7048
7049
7050
7051
7052
7053
7054
7055
7056
7057
7058
7059
7060
7061
7062
7063
7064
7065
7066
7067
7068
7069
7070
7071
7072
7073
7074
7075
7076
7077
7078
7079
7080
7081
7082
7083
7084
7085
7086
7087
7088
7089
7090
7091
7092
7093
7094
7095
7096
7097
7098
7099
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70158
70159
70160
70161
70162
70163
70164
70165
70166
70167
70168
70169
70170
70171
70172
70173
70174
70175
70176
70177
70178
70179
70180
70181
70182
70183
70184
70185
70186
70187
70188
70189
70190
70191
70192
70193
70194
70195
70196
70197
70198
70199
70100
70101
70102
70103
70104
70105
70106
70107
70108
70109
70110
70111
70112
70113
70114
70115
70116
70117
70118
70119
70120
70121
70122
70123
70124
70125
70126
70127
70128
70129
70130
70131
70132
70133
70134
70135
70136
70137
70138
70139
70140
70141
70142
70143
70144
70145
70146
70147
70148
70149
70150
70151
70152
70153
70154
70155
70156
70157
70

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

2	I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
3			
4	II.	FACTS.....	1
5			
6	A.	Waymo Has Repeatedly Over-Designated Exhibit 10.....	1
7	B.	The Court Denied The Sealing Motion To Most Of Exhibit 10.	3
8	C.	Waymo Files Multiple Declarations In Support Of Otto Trucking's Publicly	
9		Filed Version Of Exhibit 10.	4
10	D.	Waymo Fails To Designate Multiple Depositions Discussing	
11		Under The Protective Order.....	5
12	E.	Waymo First Challenges The Sufficiency Of Otto Trucking's Redactions	
13		To Exhibit 10 On September 27, 2017 And The Filings Are Provisionally	
14		Locked And Replaced.	5
15	III.	IS NOT AEO – OR EVEN CONFIDENTIAL -	
16		INFORMATION.....	7
17	IV.	WAYMO'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS SHOULD BE DENIED FOR	
18		ADDITIONAL REASONS.....	8
19	1.	Otto Trucking Made A Good Faith Attempt To Comply With the	
20		Court's Sealing Order.....	9
21	2.	Waymo Waived Any Legitimate Complaints It May Have Had	
22		About The Public Filing Of The Name	10
23	3.	Waymo Waived Any Complaints It May Have Had By Failing To	
24		Designate Multiple Deposition Transcripts Discussing	
25		with Any Confidentiality At All.	10
26	4.	Waymo Fails to Show How the Remedies It Seeks are Warranted.	11
27	V.	CONCLUSION	
28			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)	
2	Cases
4	<i>Aevoe Corp. v. AE Tech. Co.</i> , No. 2:12-CV-00053-GMN, 2014 WL 551563 (D. Nev. Feb. 7, 2014).....7
6	<i>Amersham Pharmacia Biotech, Inc. v. Perkin-Elmer Corp.</i> , 190 F.R.D. 644 (N.D. Cal. 2000) (Infante, Mag. J.)8
8	<i>Contratto v. Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 227 F.R.D. 304 (N.D. Cal. 2005)7, 8
10	<i>FormFactor, Inc v. Micro-Probe, Inc.</i> , No. C-10-03095 PJH JCS, 2012 WL 1575093 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2012)11
12	<i>Guzik Tech. Enterprises, Inc. v. W. Digital Corp.</i> , No. 5:11-CV-03786-PSG, 2013 WL 6199629 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2013).....7
14	<i>Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu</i> , 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).....6, 7
15	<i>Layer 2 Communications Inc. v . Flexera Software LLC</i> , No. C-13-02131 DMR, 2014 WL 2536993 (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2014).....10
17	<i>Linex Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. C 13-159 CW, 2014 WL 6901744 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2014)7, 8
18	<i>Lofton v. Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC</i> , 308 F.R.D. 276 (N.D. Cal. 2015)8
20	<i>Mendez v. Cty. of San Bernardino</i> , 540 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2008).....8
21	<i>Rooney v. Sierra Pac. Windows</i> , No. 10-CV-00905-LHK, 2011 WL 2149097 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2011).....8, 11
22	<i>United States v. Gurtner</i> , 474 F.2d 297 (9th Cir. 1973).....10

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This is a motion for sanctions over the public disclosure of a domain name. The motion is
 3 meritless. Waymo's motion for sanctions should be denied for at least the following reasons.

4 *First*, the version of Exhibit 10 that Otto Trucking LLC ("Otto Trucking") publicly filed
 5 does not on its face violate the Court's September 1, 2017 sealing order (Dkt. #1444).
 6 Furthermore, Otto Trucking's redactions represent a good faith attempt to comply with the Court's
 7 order, notwithstanding the parties' present disagreement.

8 *Second*, Waymo waived any confidentiality with respect to the domain name in multiple
 9 ways. Waymo filed multiple declarations in support of sealing the version of Exhibit 10 that it
 10 now complains is improper. ***To repeat: Waymo filed multiple declarations affirmatively
 11 supporting the sealing of the version of Exhibit 10 that publicly disclosed the domain name for
 12 the SVN server.*** Waymo also failed to designate portions of multiple deposition transcripts
 13 discussing the domain name under the Protective Order. Indeed, even while it is moving for
 14 sanctions against Otto Trucking, Waymo *still* has not tried to designate portions of the these
 15 depositions transcripts as confidential under the Protective Order. Waymo has not sought
 16 reconsideration of any of the Court's previous sealing orders. It has merely insisted that the entire
 17 document be locked down until its motion for sanctions is resolved.

18 < i>Third, Waymo unreasonably delayed raising any issue with Otto Trucking's redacted
 19 version of Exhibit 10 until September 27, 2017, when Waymo first raised an issue during the
 20 deposition of a witness. But by this point, multiple Waymo witnesses already had been questioned
 21 about the SVN server domain name in depositions that Waymo did not designate as confidential.
 22 It was perfectly reasonable for Otto Trucking to believe that it could question more witnesses
 23 about the domain name.

24 **II. FACTS**

25 **A. Waymo Has Repeatedly Over-Designated Exhibit 10.**

26 Waymo has consistently overstated the confidential designations of its documents, using
 27 blanket designations to tag documents wholly confidential, rather than tailoring redactions as

1 required under the protective order. Dkt. No. 1910-2 (Protective Order) ¶ 5.1. Indeed, the Court
 2 has commented several times on Waymo's over-designation of confidentiality, most recently on
 3 September 6, 2017, stating, "Waymo's proposed redactions, however, are not "narrowly tailored"
 4 as required by Civil Local Rule 79-5 to seek sealing only of asserted trade secrets. With respect to
 5 Exhibit 10, Defendants have raised this issue of Waymo's over-designations to the Court on at
 6 least three separate occasions.

7 On August 27, 2017, Otto Trucking filed an administrative motion to seal (the "Sealing
 8 Motion") in connection with its opposition to Waymo's motion to quash subpoenas. Dkt. 1377.
 9 During the Court's August 28, 2017 hearing on the underlying motion, Defendants explained that
 10 Waymo has been using indiscriminate assertions of confidentiality in designating otherwise public
 11 information. Otto Trucking raised the issue with Exhibit 10 specifically and noted for the Court
 12 that Waymo had designated the entirety of this document as confidential. The Court agreed it did
 13 not believe that "any of this [was] confidential," and instructed Waymo to amend its designations:
 14 "*I will give [Waymo] some advice because maybe this will help. I don't see why any of this is
 15 confidential, but I understand. Everything is designated confidential—*"). Lin Decl. Exh. 1 at
 16 17:6–18:6 (emphasis added).

17 At a second hearing two days later on August 30, the Court reminded Waymo of its
 18 obligations to submit its declarations with appropriate tailored redactions: "I guess I said, Mr.
 19 Baker, that tomorrow is Waymo's deadline to submit a declaration, if it can, just define the
 20 confidentiality or AEOs of the emails that Otto Trucking submitted in connection with Docket No.
 21 1377. And I'm just telling you because I'm going to get on it right tomorrow because Judge Alsup
 22 has asked me to." Lin Decl. Exh. 2 at 16:7–15.

23 At the third hearing the next day on August 31, the Court explained again, "[Waymo is]
 24 going to submit their [sealing] declaration, and it will be done. So either they've justified it, or
 25 they haven't. *For some of them, I'm assuming they're not going to even try because it was so
 26 obvious that it wasn't.*" Lin Decl. Exh. 3 at 59:10–60:1 (emphasis added).

1 **B. The Court Denied The Sealing Motion To Most Of Exhibit 10.**

2 In an Order dated September 1, the Court granted in part and denied in part the Sealing
 3 Motion (the “Sealing Order”). Dkt. No. 1444. The Court found good cause to file under seal
 4 Exhibits 3–9 and 11–12 of the Sealing Motion. *Id.* However as to the letter brief and most of
 5 Exhibit 10, the Court instructed these documents be filed publicly. *Id.* As to Exhibit 10 only, the
 6 Court ordered public filing “except for the email addresses, the technical information on the first
 7 and sixth pages (id. at 2, 7), and the IP address on the third page (id. at 4).” *Id.* As the Court
 8 explained: “This information [was] not properly sealable as it contain[ed] neither trade secret
 9 information nor information otherwise subject to sealing.” *Id.*

10 Otto Trucking prepared a redacted Exhibit 10 as instructed. As to the email addresses
 11 throughout the Exhibit and the IP address on the third page (*id.* at 4), they were sealed. The same
 12 is true of the technical information on the first (*id.* at 2) and sixth pages (*id.* at 7) of the Exhibit.
 13 The only technical term found on the first and sixth pages of the Exhibit is the term, “[REDACTED]
 14 referring to the [REDACTED]
 15 Furthermore, in the same as where “[REDACTED]” is found on the first page, Mr. Zbrozek explains that
 16 “[REDACTED]” is Waymo’s [REDACTED]. Out of an abundance of caution, Otto Trucking
 17 redacted both “[REDACTED]” and “[REDACTED]” in accordance with the instructions from the Court. Otto
 18 Trucking filed the public versions of both the letter brief and Exhibit 10 on September 6.
 19 Dkt. No. 1481; Lin Decl. Exh. 4.

20 On September 1, counsel for Waymo and defendants communicated about redactions to
 21 Exhibit 10 following Judge Corley’s order. Even given the Court’s guidance, Waymo took a
 22 generous view of the order and extensively redacted Exhibit 10. Uber and Waymo engaged in a
 23 meet and confer and only included one counsel from Otto Trucking instead of the agreed-upon
 24 email distribution for the Otto Trucking legal team. Uber and Waymo agreed to include the
 25 domain name in the redactions for purposes of sharing the information with the client, even
 26 though it was not covered by the Court’s sealing order. On September 6, Otto Trucking filed the
 27 version of Exhibit 10 that is at issue now. Lin Decl. ¶¶ 10, 11. Because the entire Otto Trucking
 28

1 team had not been cc'd on the email, Otto Trucking filed a different version of the document from
 2 the document that was discussed between Uber and Waymo. *Id.* ¶ 9. This confusion is
 3 understandable, as one conversation was reaching agreement to share with a client on shortened
 4 time and another was to comply with the Court's order. To the extent there was a
 5 misunderstanding, Waymo could have easily remedied the situation. However, unlike so many
 6 other instances where Waymo has not hesitated to immediately identify a faulty redaction in a
 7 filing, Waymo never noticed this error. Instead, it accepted that the public disclosure was proper
 8 and even endorsed it (as set forth below).

9 **C. Waymo Files Multiple Declarations In Support Of Otto Trucking's Publicly
 10 Filed Version Of Exhibit 10.**

11 During the month of September there were numerous disputes between Waymo and
 12 Uber/Ottomotto regarding the public filing of allegedly confidential information. But Waymo did
 13 not raise any issues with Otto Trucking's version of Exhibit 10 until September 27, 2017.

14 Between September 6 and September 27, 2017, Otto Trucking publicly filed and served
 15 Exhibit 10 in seven other subsequent filings the same way as it did for its September 6 Notice of
 16 Refiling. *See* Waymo's Motion for Sanctions ("Mot.") at 6–7. In each of these seven subsequent
 17 filings, Otto Trucking filed administrative motions to seal corresponding to each of the exhibit
 18 lists, which included Exhibit 10. Waymo did not object to the filing of Exhibit 10 in any of these
 19 seven subsequent filings.

20 To the contrary, Waymo affirmatively filed four declarations in support of these seven
 21 subsequent filings by Otto Trucking.¹ In each of these declarations, Waymo says it reviewed the
 22 exhibits in the corresponding Otto Trucking sealing motion, and filed a declaration in support of
 23 sealing. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 1659 at ¶ 1 ("I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this
 24 Declaration, and if called as a witness I would testify competently to those matters."); *see also*

25
 26 ¹ (1) Waymo's sealing declaration at Dkt. No. 1659 in support of Otto Trucking's sealing motion
 27 at Dkt. No. 1540; (2) Waymo's sealing declaration at Dkt. No. 1698 in support of Otto Trucking's
 28 sealing motion at Dkt. No. 1585; (3) Waymo's sealing declaration at Dkt. No. 1718 in support of
 Otto Trucking's sealing motion at Dkt. No. 1618; (4) Waymo's sealing declaration at Dkt. No.
 1719 in support of Otto Trucking's sealing motion at Dkt. No. 1609.

1 Dkt. No. 1698 (same); Dkt. No. 1718 (same); Dkt. No. 1719 (same). This is the same procedure
 2 Waymo used in filing a declaration in support of Otto Trucking's August 27 Sealing Motion.
 3 Waymo did not object to the filing of Exhibit 10 in the course of filing any of these four Waymo
 4 sealing declarations.

5 **D. Waymo Fails To Designate Multiple Depositions Discussing [REDACTED]
 6 Under The Protective Order.**

7 Waymo also admitted that the "[REDACTED]" domain name was public through two
 8 depositions in this case. While the general approach of the parties has been to designate a whole
 9 transcript as confidential at the outset, the parties have agreed that each party has 9 days from the
 10 date of a deposition to designate portions of a deposition under the Interim Protective Order. All
 11 other portions will be automatically de-designated. *See* Lin Decl. Exhs. 5, 6, 7.

12 In both the depositions of Sasha Zbrozek and Gary Brown, the [REDACTED] domain and its
 13 applicability to the SVN server were discussed and designated. Mr. Zbrozek was deposed on
 14 September 6 and these terms were used extensively. At no point has Waymo ever designated any
 15 of Mr. Zbrozek's deposition under the Interim Protective Order. Mr. Baker was present for the
 16 entirety of Mr. Zbrozek's deposition.

17 Similarly, Mr. Brown's deposition on September 6 also included discussion of the term,
 18 "[REDACTED]" It too appears in the final transcript, as does his testimony of other information
 19 relating to the SVN server and Waymo security. Again, Waymo did not designate the portions of
 20 Mr. Brown's deposition discussing [REDACTED] under the Interim Protective Order. Mr. Baker
 21 was also present for the entirety of this deposition.

22 **E. Waymo First Challenges The Sufficiency Of Otto Trucking's Redactions To
 23 Exhibit 10 On September 27, 2017 And The Filings Are Provisionally Locked
 24 And Replaced.**

25 Waymo first notified Otto Trucking of its objection to the filing of Exhibit 10 at the
 26 deposition of Bruce Hartley on September 27. *See* Boock Decl. at ¶¶ 2-12. Near the end of the
 27 deposition, when counsel for Otto Trucking questioned Mr. Hartley about an incorrect statement
 28 in his report that the SVN's domain name was not publicly known, for the first time, counsel for

1 Waymo objected to the public filing of [REDACTED] and demanded immediate action. *Id.* at
 2 ¶¶ 6-7.² Counsel for Otto Trucking stated that he had alerted the team and that they were looking
 3 into the matter. *Id.* at 8. Later, in a 6:09 p.m. email, Waymo accused Otto Trucking of
 4 “violat[ing] the Court’s order,” and demanded that Otto Trucking immediately lock all ECF
 5 entries of the Exhibit 10 filing. *See* Dkt. No. 1910-11 at 3. The email cited to Waymo’s Sealing
 6 Declaration that the Court had already considered, and nothing further. *See id.* Otto Trucking
 7 replied at 7:56 p.m. stating that this Court had already ruled on this issue, and it was confused by
 8 Waymo’s belated objection. *Id.* Otto Trucking sought the basis for Waymo’s demand 21 days
 9 later, explaining that this information was already public pursuant to the parties’ agreement to
 10 designate transcripts. *Id.*

11 In subsequent emails and telephone conferences, Waymo continued to demand that Otto
 12 Trucking take corrective measures, without explaining why the information should be sealed, why
 13 Waymo waited 21 days to raise this issue, or why Waymo did not timely serve confidentiality
 14 designations to address this issue. *See id.* Waymo also failed to explain how the Protective Order
 15 has been violated given that it is silent on how to the parties should proceed where 1) the Court
 16 has already ruled on confidentiality and 2) where a party has waived confidentiality of that
 17 information in other ways.

18 After receiving direction from the Court to provisionally lock Exhibit 10 and re-file
 19 redacted versions pending motion practice by the parties as to whether this information should be
 20 sealed, Otto Trucking locked down the filings at issue and re-filed redacted versions of Exhibit 10.

21 On October 1, 2017, Waymo filed a motion for sanctions. Dkt. 1909. Waymo does not
 22 seek reconsideration of any of the Court’s sealing orders. In fact, Waymo provides no explanation
 23 for why the SVN server’s domain name—which is essentially a web address—is confidential,
 24

25 ² Contrary to Waymo’s contention, there was no withholding of the public filing of the SVN
 26 domain name for strategic purposes. Indeed, Otto Trucking had duly served all of the filings that
 27 referenced the web address on Waymo, and Waymo filed sealing declarations in support of Otto
 28 Trucking’s redactions. Counsel for Otto Trucking believed that Waymo’s expert had incorrectly
 stated that [REDACTED] was not public similar to other errors found in the expert reports. See
 Boock Decl. at 2-5.

1 much less AEO. Waymo also does not provide any explanation for why it failed to serve
 2 confidentiality designations to protect the name of its SVN server or raise the public filing of the
 3 name of the server for 21 days despite having someone review the filings and submit sealing
 4 declarations. It did not file any declaration from Waymo or Google attesting to the confidential
 5 nature of the SVN server's domain name. Instead, Waymo moved for sanctions against
 6 Defendants for publicly filing information that Waymo failed to designate as confidential.

7 **III. [REDACTED] IS NOT AEO – OR EVEN CONFIDENTIAL -**
 8 **INFORMATION.**

9 As a prerequisite to proving sanctions, Waymo first must show that the domain name
 10 [REDACTED] is confidential. It has repeatedly not done so, as set forth above, and has not done
 11 so here. Further, because the filings include briefing on Waymo's motion for partial summary
 12 judgment, Waymo must show a compelling reason for protection. *See e.g., Kamakana v. City &*
 13 *Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–79 (9th Cir. 2006). Under the compelling reason standard,
 14 the party must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings” that outweigh
 15 the public’s right to access of the judicial record. *Id.* General assertions that competitors and the
 16 public should not gain access to the information because it is “confidential” and contains
 17 “sensitive business information” fails to meet the standard. *Aevoe Corp. v. AE Tech. Co.*, No.
 18 2:12-CV-00053-GMN, 2014 WL 551563, at *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 7, 2014) (denying motion to seal);
 19 *see also Guzik Tech. Enterprises, Inc. v. W. Digital Corp.*, No. 5:11-CV-03786-PSG, 2013 WL
 20 6199629, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2013) (A declaration stating a document “makes reference to
 21 ‘the structure and function of the Accused Products’ containing ‘highly sensitive confidential
 22 financial and business information’ do not point out with particularity why these documents must
 23 be sealed). Even under the less stringent “good cause” standard—applied under Rule 26(c) for
 24 non-dispositive motions—broad, conclusory allegations of harm will not suffice; the showing
 25 must be supported by “specific demonstrations of fact, supported where possible by affidavits and
 26 concrete examples.” *Contratto v. Ethicon, Inc.*, 227 F.R.D. 304, 307–08 (N.D. Cal. 2005). For
 27 instance, a declaration claiming that “releasing the materials to the public record would

1 competitively disadvantage HP [] in negotiating future fee agreements with firms or clients" does
 2 not constitute the necessary "particularized showing." *Linex Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*,
 3 No. C 13-159 CW, 2014 WL 6901744, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2014).

4 Waymo has never even met the lower good cause standard. Waymo's motion for sanctions
 5 has provided no argument or factual support that [REDACTED] should be sealed. Waymo has
 6 not accounted for its failure to designate this information as confidential and has submitted no
 7 declaration from either Waymo or Google attesting to the confidential nature of this web address.
 8 In fact, it has repeatedly endorsed the redaction approach shown on Exhibit 10 in several court
 9 filings.

10 Waymo's prior sealing declarations repeatedly declared in boilerplate language that certain
 11 exhibits contain "highly sensitive information," containing "domains that host Waymo's highly
 12 confidential SVN repository and other computer systems," where public access would "give bad
 13 actors seeking to hack Waymo's databases a target to attack." *See e.g.*, Dkt. No. 1659 ¶ 5; Dkt.
 14 No. 1698 ¶ 5; Dkt. No. 1718 ¶ 5; Dkt. No. 1719 ¶ 5. This is merely a broad conclusory
 15 statement, devoid of "specific demonstrations of fact, supported where possible by affidavits and
 16 concrete examples." *See Contratto*, 227 F.R.D. at 307–08. Waymo's assertion that public access
 17 would lead to hackers attacking Waymo's databases is completely unsubstantiated, like the
 18 deficient showing in *Linex* stating that disclosure would "completely disadvantage HP [] in
 19 negotiating future fee agreements with firms or clients." Waymo's circular labeling of the SVN
 20 repository as "highly confidential" information cannot overcome the public's right of access to
 21 judicial records, especially as to dispositive motions as trial is approaching. Indeed, the Court has
 22 already rejected the sufficiency of this language as Waymo used it to seal Exhibit 10, and the
 23 Court only ordered that email addresses, "technical" information, and an IP address found on a
 24 different page be sealed with no mention of the domain name. *See* Dkt. 1433; 1444.

25 **IV. WAYMO'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS SHOULD BE DENIED FOR
 26 ADDITIONAL REASONS.**

27 A court's "inherent power" to issue sanctions must be made based on a specific finding of

1 “bad faith.” *Lofton v. Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC*, 308 F.R.D. 276, 285 (N.D. Cal. 2015). The
 2 bad faith requirement is a “high threshold.” *Id.* at 285. It encompasses more than mere negligence
 3 or even recklessness, *Mendez v. Cty. of San Bernardino*, 540 F.3d 1109, 1131–32 (9th Cir. 2008),
 4 but rather “willful misconduct or recklessness that is coupled with an improper purpose,” or
 5 conduct “tantamount to bad faith.” *Lofton*, 308 F.R.D. at 285.

6 Under Rule 37, the moving party bears the burden to make the threshold showing of what
 7 discovery order has been violated. *See Rooney v. Sierra Pac. Windows*, No. 10-CV-00905-LHK,
 8 2011 WL 2149097, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2011). The movant’s failure to meet that threshold is
 9 grounds to deny the motion. *Id.* Where the movant seeks preclusion of evidence under Rule 37,
 10 this Court has explained that “[e]xclusion sanctions based on alleged discovery violations are
 11 generally improper absent undue prejudice to the opposing side.” *Amersham Pharmacia Biotech,
 12 Inc. v. Perkin–Elmer Corp.*, 190 F.R.D. 644, 648 (N.D. Cal. 2000) (Infante, Mag. J.) (citing *Wendt
 13 v. Host Int’l, Inc.*, 125 F.3d 806, 814 (9th Cir. 1997)).

14 **1. Otto Trucking Made A Good Faith Attempt To Comply With the
 15 Court’s Sealing Order.**

16 After “carefully consider[ing] the narrowed redactions,” the Court denied sealing Exhibit
 17 10 “except for the email addresses, the technical information on the first and sixth pages (*id.* at 2,
 18 7), and the IP address on the third page (*id.* at 4).” *Id.* Sealing of the domain name
 19 [REDACTED] was not mentioned at all in the order. “This information [was] not properly
 20 sealable as it contain[ed] neither trade secret information nor information otherwise subject to
 21 sealing.” *Id.*

22 As a result, Otto Trucking made amended redactions to Exhibit 10. As understood, the
 23 only technical terms that is common on both the first page (*id.* at 2) and the sixth page (*id.* at 7), is
 24 the term, [REDACTED].” Because the term, “[REDACTED] appears in the same paragraph immediately
 25 following [REDACTED],” out of an abundance of caution Otto Trucking redacted this term as well. In
 26 addition, Otto Trucking redacted the email addresses on all pages of the Exhibit were redacted, as
 27 was the IP address listed on page 3 (Dkt. No. 1433-16 at 4). While Uber and Waymo may have
 28

1 agreed to interim redactions associated with what could be shared with the client, this does not
 2 change the Court's order.

3 Nevertheless, once Waymo belatedly raised an issue with Otto Trucking's publicly filed
 4 version of Exhibit 10, the Court ordered that the publicly filed version was locked and replaced
 5 with a newly redacted version of Exhibit 10. No further remedy or relief is warranted.³

6 **2. Waymo Waived Any Legitimate Complaints It May Have Had About
 7 The Public Filing Of The Name [REDACTED].**

8 Waymo had known about Otto Trucking's publicly filed version of redacted Exhibit 10
 9 since September 6. Moreover, it has also known about Exhibit 10 from the seven other
 10 subsequent sealing motions that included Exhibit 10. Finally, Waymo has known about this
 11 public filing because Waymo filed four declarations in support of those sealing motions and in
 12 each, stated under oath that Waymo counsel had personal knowledge of the contents of the
 13 motion. Through these declarations, *Waymo endorsed the very version of Exhibit 10 it now*
 14 *challenges*. Indeed, Waymo has consistently raised issues with defendants where it believed its
 15 1659 at ¶ 1 ("I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this Declaration, and if called
 16 as a witness I would testify of Refiling, (2) Otto Trucking's seven other filings of Exhibit 10, and
 17 (3) Waymo's four sealing declarations, Waymo did not raise any objections to the filing of Exhibit
 18 10 until September 27.

19 **3. Waymo Waived Any Complaints It May Have Had By Failing To
 20 Designate Multiple Deposition Transcripts Discussing [REDACTED]
 21 with Any Confidentiality At All.**

22 Here, Mr. Zbrozek's and Mr. Brown's final deposition transcripts were served on
 23 September 8. Both discussed the SVN server, and both discussed [REDACTED] in particular.
 24 Waymo had until September 17, 2017 to designate portions of these transcripts as confidential

25 ³ Waymo complaints ring hollow given Waymo's own improper filing of confidential information
 26 in the public record. For example, on October 2, Waymo publicly filed the entire Stroz report
 27 publicly despite the language in the Federal Circuit's recent opinion and the district judge's order
 28 to "keep it, quote, at the low-level confidential, among yourselves, and not give it to the New York
 Times and everybody else." 9/20/17 Hr'g Tr. 11:20-22. Shortly after Waymo's filing, a media
 storm about the Stroz report ensued.

1 under the Protective Order and the parties' agreed-to shortened 9 day designation deadline.
 2 Waymo did not do so with respect to the portions of the transcripts discussing [REDACTED].
 3 Thus, the domain name [REDACTED] has already been designated as non-confidential. *See*
 4 *Layer 2 Communications Inc. v. Flexera Software LLC*, No. C-13-02131 DMR, 2014 WL
 5 2536993, at *6-7 (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2014) (failure to designate deposition excerpts as confidential
 6 constituted waiver of both confidentiality and privilege); *see also United States v. Gurtner*, 474
 7 F.2d 297, 299 (9th Cir. 1973) (A party must assert privilege when the evidence is first presented,
 8 or it waives the right to claim privilege.).

9 Indeed, Waymo *still* has not served any designations for either Mr. Zbrozek's or Mr.
 10 Brown's deposition transcripts. Therefore, at trial of this matter, or in future public filings, any
 11 party can safely file the portions of Mr. Zbrozek's or Mr. Brown's depositions discussing
 12 [REDACTED] in the public record without violating the Protective Order.

13 **4. Waymo Fails to Show How the Remedies It Seeks are Warranted.**

14 Waymo fails to show how any of the sanctions it requests are appropriate. In particular,
 15 sanctions that prohibit a party from introducing evidence requires the movant to clear a high bar,
 16 as they "are typically reserved only for flagrant discovery abuses." *FormFactor, Inc v. Micro-*
 17 *Probe, Inc.*, No. C-10-03095 PJH JCS, 2012 WL 1575093, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2012)
 18 (citation omitted). Waymo has not shown how Otto Trucking violated the Sealing Order, how
 19 Waymo has been prejudiced, or how the domain name is not non-confidential based on Waymo's
 20 failure to designate this information under the Protective Order. Waymo's own failures to
 21 designate confidentiality and review the filings it was submitting declarations to seal are what has
 22 led to this dispute. Sanctions are not appropriate. *See Rooney v. Sierra Pac. Windows*, No. 10-CV-
 23 00905-LHK, 2011 WL 2149097 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2011) (sanctions not warranted where there
 24 was no prejudice or the conduct at issue was substantially justified).

25 Finally, monetary damages and fees should be denied. Waymo should not get to profit off
 26 of its attempt to foist its own oversight onto Defendants, especially where Waymo has not
 27 demonstrated why [REDACTED] is confidential in the first instance, and has failed to provide

1 any explanation for its failure to raise this issue for three weeks after the filing of Exhibit 10 or its
2 refusal to serve confidentiality designations.

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should DENY Waymo's Motion for Sanctions.

5 Dated: October 4, 2017

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee
8 Neel Chatterjee
nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com
9 Brett Schuman
bschuman@goodwinlaw.com
10 Shane Brun
sbrun@goodwinlaw.com
11 Rachel M. Walsh
rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com
12 Hong-An Vu
hvu@goodwinlaw.com
13 Hayes P. Hyde
hhyde@goodwinlaw.com
14 James Lin
jlin@goodwinlaw.com
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

15 *Attorneys for Defendant:*
16 Otto Trucking LLC

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing document including all of its attachments with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California by using the CM/ECF system on **October 4, 2017**. I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service of the publicly filed documents will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
October 4, 2017.

/s/ Neel Chatterjee
NEEL CHATTERJEE